

SECRETARY.—Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to lay on the table of the House, the Public Wakfs (Extension of Limitation) (Karnataka Amendment) Bill, 1978 as passed by the Legislative Council.

MR. SPEAKER.—The papers are laid on the Table of the House. **

Mysore Porcelains Ltd. (Acquisition of Shares) Bill, 1978

Motion to Consider

Debate Continued

†SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must first of all thank the Hon. Speaker for showing lot of indulgence to me while speaking on this Bill. Sir, yesterday while I was speaking I have quoted some wrong figures. I would like to correct them I said the interest amount due to Government was Rs. 69,93,469. Interest on interest was not quoted I quoted 14,98,000. If the interest is calculated on the lending rates of bank, it would be 21 lakhs. If it is calculated at 7 per cent. it would be 15 lakhs. So, I was only yesterday making out a point that there has been so much of indirect help. Sir, yesterday I was telling how the factory was built from the year 1931 to 1977, that is for a period of 45 years. So, I condemn the unwise attitude of the Government in handing over the factory to BHEL. Sir, I learn that it was handed over during September 1976 and that the shares otherwise held by Government were sold to BHEL during September or October 1976 and the management was also handed over by the Government during that period. Since then Government have no interest in it. I doubt whether the State Government is the proper authority to come forward with the legislation of calculating the interest after handing it over to the Government of India. Sir, during the year 1976 itself it has become Government of India concern. If the Government of India wanted to calculate the other shares of private individuals namely NGK Company and also small per cent of shares held by certain other member. I think the proper authorities should have been the Government of India. This is the doubt I entertain. I wish the Government would take the trouble to clarify this important point. Sir, this did not come suddenly. It came sometime during April 1976 I have got a paper cutting dated 2nd March 1976. Where the Industries Minister had made it clear that he is not selling any of the Government Factories.

The Industries Minister has made the statement in the Porcelain Factory while addressing the workers. That means the Government had given an assurance that they would not be selling away their

** Bill appended as Annexure to this volume.

interest to anybody. But very soon thereafter within 6 months they have sold it. I would refer the Hon. Minister to an editorial written by Deccan Herald on 2nd September 1976. This editorial makes it very clear that this Government had considered selling the interest of both the factories *viz.* the Porcelain Factory and the REMCO as one deal which was denied by the Hon. Minister yesterday. It says :

“Two industrial units in which the State has a substantial interest are to be handed over to a Central Organisation to be nursed back to health *viz.* Bharath Heavy Electricals.....”.

Certain observations which are pertinent are : There are dedicated workers in these units. I do not know what has happened to these dedicated works. I learn that some of them are disturbed from their positions. Some of them are assigned responsible work ; they have been removed from their responsibility. The editorial further says :

“Knowing the pivotal role and the worth of these institutions which were working at a loss there were public protests in the past. When reports came that some influential private sector organisation were attempting to gobble them up, this proves that the image of the institutions in the public eye has never been tarnished and the personnel in the institutions by and large have tried to live up to the public expectations.”

The last sentence runs as follows :

“But this tie-up should not be viewed as a precedent for mismanaged private sector institutions to attempt merger with better-placed organisations merely because in many cases the mismanagement had been deliberate and at the expense of the institutions to the benefit of a favoured few.”

Why I am referring to this is, yesterday the Hon. Minister denied that there was a backage deal and that the parting away of the interest in both the factories was one deal. I am only trying to quote an editorial of Deccan Herald dated 2nd September 1976 to show that it was one deal and not separate deals.

I have got one more point to make. I would like to bring to your notice that the Mysore Porcelain factory was doing very well. I am referring to an official magazine ‘March of Karnataka-March-April, 1976’. Here, the Government says :

“In spite of financial stringency, heavy accumulations of stock and unhealthy competition from private sector, the Mysore Porcelains Ltd. had a record total sales of Rs. 2.51 crores during the year 1975-76 which is an important mile-

stone in the history of the factory. Since its inception the Mysore Porcelains Ltd. which manufactures the sophisticated electro-porcelain insulators is one of the largest public sector units in the country.

And I am sorry to say that one of the largest institution of that type has been sold away to the Government of India. Further it says :

“The majority of the shares of factory are held by the Government of Karnataka and its financial institutions. The factory was started in the year 1931 and expanded on modern lines during the year 1957.”

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—Merely on sentiments the hon. Member goes on without taking into consideration the fact that we do not have enough capital to invest.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I cannot shed my sentiments. Yesterday the Hon. Chief Minister was not present. I have been saying that a very good factory which was built up at great sacrifice with a lot of foresight from the year 1931 to 1976 was sold away without any reason. The Hon. Chief Minister may hold a different view altogether.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—This factory would have gone into private hands even much earlier. That was prevented. Subsequently, Government was not in a position to invest enough capital for expansion. When actually the economics of the factory were worked out and it was found that it was working at a loss, we thought of giving it to the Government of India establishment which is a public sector establishment. I think my hon. Friend will feel happy that we have not sold it to some private house.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—The House would have been happy if only the Government have given that information. What was the expansion that was thought of? What was the outlay that was required? Whether it was beyond the limit of the State Government to find that money? Are we not entitled to know all that information. That information was not supplied to us. Now the Hon. Chief Minister says that the factory required urgent expansion and Government had no funds to invest, I would like to know what was the nature of the expansion and what was the amount that was required to expand and whether it was beyond the capacity of this Government to find funds. I also made a suggestion yesterday that the Government could have even asked the private persons to invest in it. It was not a Government factory in a strict sence. Government's contribution was kept at 40 lakhs. It would have become a

Government concern if their were 51 lakhs. The Public Undertakings Committee had made that observation also. Why did the Government not think of contributing another 11 lakhs more as share capital out of loan. They could have done that and treated it as a Government Company. I do not know what was the reason. Nowhere is it given.

11-00 A.M.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— Yesterday before we started the discussion we asked what were the compelling reasons to part with the State Industry. The Hon'ble Minister was not in a position to give information. He was running to the lobby and coming and he could not give. If he had given reasons we would not have raised these issues.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I am sorry. I have already given every bit of detail the members wanted.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— In fact he has misled the House. I asked whether the interest of all the employees were protected and he said 'yes'. Thirty people have been removed.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I was giving reply to the points then and there. I said the reason for handing over the Porcelain Factory. It was a package as in respect of Remco. It is not as if B H E L said unless you give Porcelain we will not take. Remco and BHEL and been negotiating. We have sold for Rs. 5 crores and all the losses have been borne by the BHEL. The employees of the Porcelain Factory are continued. These 30 employees were appointed by the Managing Director illegally. So they were removed. They were purely temporary. There is apprehension about one Sri G. Krishnappa. That is the crux of the whole issue. What happened to him? That was the question by Sri H.D. Deve Gowda. He is still continued as an Officer on Special Duty. He has been offered the post of Deputy Manager in BHEL at Hyderabad with higher emoluments. He has not agreed he has gone on leave. The whole thing appears to me that it is not the question of handing over these two factories to BHEL but the question is that pertaining to one individual. It appears to me like that.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—We are not interested.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—This has been done only to see that the interest of economy of the State is not affected. The State had no money to invest for its development. It was question of crores.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.— While introducing it if all the information had been given we would not have talked about it.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.— I am sorry. I did not expect all these things would be covered under the present Bill. It is only replacement of the ordinance.

SRI J. H. PATEL.— On the other hand he give responsibility to some other Minister and went out.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I am sorry. I told the House that I had to go and meet some delegation which had come from New York.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I am sorry the Minister seems to have a feeling that keeping in view the interest of one individual all these discussions are going on. It is far from truth. Mr. Speaker, kindly go through the debate. I have never mentioned about the treatment given to officials. Today, casually I made a remark.

I was referring to the editorial. One other sentence here states:

“BHEL plays a strategic part in the industrial development of the country. The two units which were mentioned as State companies were assisting the BHEL. Hereafter they will be more intimately connected with Bhopal unit.”

I am emphasising the word ‘assisting’ these two units were assisting the BHEL. These units were working very well. I am referring to the article which is your own official magazine.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Kindly pass it on to me.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.— Yes, I have also profusely quoted from the Report of the Public Undertakings Committee. I firmly believe that the Government have not been wise in taking a decision to sell their interest to BHEL. The company was sold in September 1976. why was there delay even to bring this measure? I would like to know whether there is any correspondence between the Government of Mysore and the Government of India or BHEL or Porcelain Factory or whether any discussion has taken place and whether those discussions have been confirmed. What is usually done in industrial circles is exchange of letters. Are we not entitled to know all that? It was a factory started in 1931. We had foreign collaboration. The collaborators were there. Out of Six Directors two technical directors were on the spot directing working of the factory. I am sorry to state that the observation made in the Statement of Objects and Reasons are not honest. They say the working of the factory was not satisfactory. How can a factory in which two collaborators coming from the well known NGEK was not working satisfactorily. How the Management could be wrong when there were Government Directors? It is a self-condemnation if the Government says that the Management was not satisfactory. Sir, they say another things, i.e., in the national interest it was handed over. If it had continued in the hands of the State Government, was it not serving the national interest? It is a public undertaking. There is only one redeeming

feature that it was not sold to others. If they extend that logic, they can hand over any of the factories tomorrow. Supposing they hand over VISL to the Steel Authority of India.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—They are asking for it.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—We are also shareholders of VISL. Supposing the shares are sold and Ordinance would be issued and after a few months they will come before the House and say that it has been already handed over!

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I can understand the trend of the argument. The point that the hon'ble member is trying to harp on is national interest. Certainly, it is in the national interest to run these factories by public sector. At one stage, I know, who wanted to handover REMCO to whom. We did not do it. On that stand, at least, the Government will have to be complimented. It is not at all in the national interest to hold a company go on losing. We were continuously making profits in the Porcelain factory, but in 1974-75 it incurred a loss of Rs. 45 lakhs. BHEL, come forward that they would have an Expansion Scheme and we said it is all right. The factory is not going out of the State. I can understand if it had been taken away from here. It is not only serving the interests of the State, but it is in the national interest to see a factory to expand and more people get employment. From that angle it has been sold. If it had been given to some private company I can understand that the Government would not have been in a justifiable position to defend it.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, let the Hon'ble Chief Minister get the figures and try to draw an inference. For the information of the Hon'ble Chief Minister and the Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill, I would like to state that during 1971-72 it has made a profit of Rs. 8,53,091, during 1972-73 it has made a profit of Rs. 5,91,940 and during 1973-74 it has made a profit of Rs. 3,19,088. This factory incurred a loss of Rs. 45 lakhs during the year 1974-75. The information is available in the official Magazine as to why that loss was incurred. They had committed themselves and has accepted orders. But all of a sudden the fuel price went up by 100 per cent. There was no clause for price escalation, and therefore they had to respect the orders they had already booked, and hence there was loss during that year. At the time this factory was handed over, it had accepted an order of more than Rs. 8 crores. It was a very good factory. There are so many good factories, which even the Government of India may be anxious to take over. Now the Hon'ble Chief Minister said that the Steel Authority of India are asking for VISL. also Sir, you know what an amount of sacrifice we have made to build up that

factory. I do not want to take more time of this House on this matter. I am firmly convinced that this is a package deal. BHEL, wanted to take Porcelain factory also along with REMCO.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT (Minister for Industries and Commerce).—I have been telling since yesterday that it is not correct.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, that is my firm opinion. Let the Government place before us the letters that have been exchanged between the Government of India and the State Government or between BHEL and Mysore Porcelain Factory. Let them place before us at least the record of discussions. In the absence of all these things, I am quite right in concluding that this is a package deal and Government is not prepared to take this House to their confidence and give all the information that we have been seeking since yesterday. I oppose very vehemently this Bill.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್ (ಜಯನಗರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಪೋರ್ಸಲೇನ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯ ಮೇನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಅದಕ್ಷತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಆ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ನಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿ. ಎಚ್. ಇ. ಎಲ್. ಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಗವಣಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಿಳಿದಿರುವಂತೆ ಈ ಮೊದಲು ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಗೌರ್ಮಂಟ್ ಎಲಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕಲ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯನ್ನು ನ್ಯೂ ಗೌರ್ಮಂಟ್ ಎಲಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕಲ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ, ವೆಸ್ಟ್-ಜರ್ಮನಿಯಿಂದ ಕೋಲಾಬರೆಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ನಡೆಸಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳೇ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ ಈಗ ಇದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾದಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಸಹ ಗಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಪೋರ್ಸಲೇನ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮೇನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದು ನಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ಈ ನಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣಕರ್ತರು ಯಾರು? ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೋ, ಅವರೇ ಇದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರಣಕರ್ತರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ನಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗ ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೇ ಹೊರತು ಇದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ತಾವೇ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವಿಕೇಂದ್ರೀಕರಣವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ, ಇದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ವಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ?

ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರು ಏನಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳೇನಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಐ.ಟಿ.ಐ., ಬಿ.ಎಚ್.ಇ.ಎಲ್. ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಯವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮೇಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನಾಗಿ ತಂದು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೋತ್ಸಾಹ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳು ಕೆಲಸವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೆ? ಇನ್ನು ತಾವು ವರ್ಕ್ ಸ್ಯಾಟಿಸ್‌ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ಆದರೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಆಡಳಿತ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಐ.ಟಿ.ಐ. ಮತ್ತು ಬಿ.ಹೆಚ್.ಇ.ಎಲ್.ನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೇ ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ. ಎಫ್.ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬರ ತಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಬಲಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ರೆಂಕೋದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದ ನಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಮಾಡದೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಪೊರಲಿನ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದೇ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಭಾಷಣಕಾರರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ

ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಆಪರೇಟಿಂಗ್ ನಿಟೀಸ್ ಇರಬೇಕು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಗ್ರಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮದೇವ್ (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ).—ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಪಿಂಗಾಣಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಂಡರ್‌ಟೇಕಿಂಗ್‌ನ ಬಿ. ಎಚ್. ಇ. ಎಲ್.ಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸತಕ್ಕದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಸಮರ್ಥತೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಇದೇ ಬಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಎಂದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಲಾರದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೊಂದು ತರಹ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಡೀಲ್ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ರೆಂಕೋದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ನಷ್ಟ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನೊಂದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಿ.ಎಚ್.ಇ. ಎಲ್. ನವರಿಗೆ ನಷ್ಟ ಆಗಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುತ್ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತೆರೆಯ ಮೇರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೊಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ತಾಯಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾರಿದಾಗ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಆಕೆಯ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಕೆಯ ಆಕೆಯ ಒಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮಗುವನ್ನು ಮಾರಿದಾಗ ಆ ಮಗುವಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಪಿಂಗಾಣಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ರೆಂಕೋ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಬಂದು ಅನ್‌ಫೇರ್ ಡೀಲ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೆ ನಾನು ಹಲವಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ರಾನ್‌ಷನ್ ಸ್ಕೀಂ ಕೂಡ ಬರುವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ನಷ್ಟ ಅದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ತುಂಬುವ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕೂಡ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ವರ್ಗಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಅನೇಕ ನೌಕರರು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾರುತ್ತಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಇಸ್ ನಾಟ್ ಸ್ಯಾಟಿಸ್ಫಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಎಂದು, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದೀರಾ ಇರುವುದೇ ಕಾರಣ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ಕಿಂಗ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಯಾರ ಓಡತದ್ದಿತ್ತು? ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ನೇಮಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವೈರಕ್ಟರ್‌ಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಲಾಸ್ ಆದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಪನಿಶ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಓಡತದ್ದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅಂಥವರ ಮೇಲೂ ಕೂಡ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಇನ್ಸುಲೇಟರ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು, ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್ಮಿಟರ್ ಲೈನ್ ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ನೈಲ್ದಾ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಿ.ಎಚ್.ಇ.ಎಲ್.ಗೆ ವರ್ಗಾಯಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇವತ್ತು ನಾವು ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಬೇರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವತ್ತು ಅವರು ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥವು ಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವಶಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀವೇ ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದರೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು, ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಬಂದೊಂದಾಗಿ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮನವಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಗೆ ದೋಷ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ನಿನ್ನೆ ತಾನೇ ಡೆಕ್ಕನ್ ಹೆರಾಲ್ಡ್ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಟಿ. ವಿ. ರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರನ್ನು ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ.ಎಫ್‌ಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇವತ್ತು ವಿಜಿಲೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ರವರು, ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ದುರುಪಯೋಗದ ಆರೋಪ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂಥಾದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಅವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದ ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ? ತಾವು ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜಿಂಗ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ

ನಾವು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇವತ್ತು ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ.ಎಫ್.ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇರಲಿವೆಂದು ತಾವು ಎಚ್.ಟಿ.ವಿ. ರೆಡಿಯವರನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನೇಮಿಸಿದೀರಿ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠ್.—ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ.ಎಫ್. ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣ್.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರರವರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮದೇವ್‌ರವರೊಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರವರಲ್ಲಿ ಭೇದವಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಂದ್ರಶೇಖರ್.—ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ.ಎಫ್.ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇತ್ತು ಅಂಥಾ ಕೆವು ಇಂಥವರನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ, ಮತ್ತೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷದಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಲಾಸ್ ಆಗಿದೆಂದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಬಿಲ್ ತರುವಂತೆ ಆಗಬಾರದೆಂದು ಉಪಾಪರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮದೇವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇವತ್ತು ಪಿಂಗಾಣಿ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ವೇಗಾಢ್ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಮನವಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಬಿ. ಎಚ್.ಇ.ಎಲ್ ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವಂಥಾ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ೧೦೦ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಶೇರ್ ವ್ಯಾಲ್ಯು ಎಂದು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ೪ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಇಂಟರ್ಸ್ಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಯಾವ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ೪ ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ? ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠ್‌ರವರ ಶೇರ್ ಇದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಮತ್ತು ನಿವೃತ್ತಿ ಹೊಂದಿದವರ ಶೇರ್ ಇದೆ.

11-30 ಎ. ಎಂ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠ್.—ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಠ್ ಅವರ ಶೇರುಗಳೇನಾದರೂ ಇವೆಯೇ ಎಂದು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್‌ಲರ್ ಪರ್ಸೆನ್ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ ? ನೇರವಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಜೇಬಿಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತೀರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ರಾಮದೇವ್.—ನಾವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಶೇರು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಆಕ್ಟೈವ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವಿರಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ? ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಪವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತಾ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮೈಕೇಲ್ ಬಿ. ಥರ್ನಾಂಡೀಸ್ (ಭಾರತಿ ನಗರ).—ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಹಿಂದೆ ರೆಂಕೋ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಪೋರ್ಸಲಿನ್ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ, ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಹಿಂದರಡು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಪೋರ್ಸಲಿನ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿ ಏನು ಇದೆ ಇದು ಜಪಾನ್ ಕಂಪನಿಯವರ ಒಂದು ಕೊಲಬರೇಷನ್‌ನಿಂದ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಂಪನಿಯ ಡೈವರ್ಸಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಥವಾ ಇಷ್ಟುಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನಿರುವುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೇವಲ ೨೦% ಷೇರುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರೂ ಅವರ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮುದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮಾರಾಟಮಾಡಿ ಲಾಭವನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? Why did not NGK willingly come forward to sell the shares ? ಈ ತರಹ ಏನಾದರೂ ಆಗಿದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಹಿಂದಿನ ವಿಚಾರ, ಎರಡನೇ ವಿಚಾರವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ಬಹುಶಃ ತಾವು ಈ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಯನ್ನು, ಬಿ.ಎಚ್.ಇ.ಎಲ್.ಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿ, ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷವು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ, ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಅಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಸಹ ಓಟ್ ಸಿಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬಿಲ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯು ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈತಪ್ಪಿಹೋದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗಳು ಇದೆ ಬಂದು ದುಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಕಳವಳಕ್ಕೆ ಎಡೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ನೋಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಉತ್ಪಾದನಾ ಉಪಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಬೆಲೆಬಾಳುವ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ೫-೬ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದ ರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಕೌಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ ನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ತೋರಿಸಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಗೆ ಬೋನಸ್ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಾಗ ಒಂದೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದಂಥ ವಸ್ತುಗಳು ಈಗ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ತೋರಿಸಿ ಬೋನಸ್ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಇದರಿಂದ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಅಕೌಂಟ್ ಮೆನ್‌ಟ್ರಿನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪುಮಾಡಿ ಯಾರೋ ಲಾಭವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯ ರೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಎನ್.ಜಿ.ಇ.ಎಫ್.ನಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. Government must be alert in regard to all these public sector industries on the basis of the past experience in these Industries. Because, public money is invested in these Industries. If there is no investigation as to why these Industries failed etc., the people will lose faith in the public sector industries. So, the Government should find out who is responsible for fall in production. It is a fact that when the industry goes to the Central Government, the men at the top will not necessarily be from the State. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರಿಂದ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಾವೀಡನ್ ಫಂಡ್, ಇ.ಎಸ್.ಐ. ಕಾಂಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂಷನ್, ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಲೋನ್ ಇವು ಗಳನ್ನು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲರ್ ಆಗಿ ಓದಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಓದಿದಂಥ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿ ಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೂ ಕೂಡ ನನ್ನ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ವಸೂಲಾದಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಹಣವು ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರು ಬಹಳ ತೊಂದರೆಪಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟಿ ಗೇಷನ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಅವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಫ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಒಂದು ದೃಢತೆ ತವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಊಹಿಸಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರೋಸಲೀನ್ ಮತ್ತು ರೆಂಕೋ ಇಂಥ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಕಾರಣವೆಂದು ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಇತರ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈಕೆಳಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ನಾವು ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಯಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಡ್ವೇಟ್ ಸೇಠ್‌ರವರು ಶಾಸಕರ ಕಡೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಹೀಗೆ ಅನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಇದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಅಡ್ವೇಟ್ ಸೇಟ್.—ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅವರ ಕಡೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ತೋರಿಸಬೇಡಿ. ನನ ಕಡೆ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಅಡ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

† SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I have heard the discussion of my worthy friends particularly of Mr. K. Puttaswamy, P. Ramadev and the Leader of the opposition. They have got certain apprehensions depending upon certain hear-sayings. I am firstly referring the editorial notes published in the March of Mysore published by the Information and Publicity Department.

Sir, The Information Department collects articles from various departments. Every one who contributes articles wants to praise himself. The Porecelain Factory man must have praised his own activity. It has appeared in the Press. It is an accepted Parliamentary practice that anything which appears in the Press might not be true. With regard to a number of items we have no belief in press statement. I am telling this House it is far from truth.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—As far as MARCH OF MYSORE concerned, it is an official magazine.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—You have been holding public office as a Minister M.L.A., and Municipal President and you know how many press statements are true. There is information published saying: 'Mr. Aziz Sait was Chairman of K.S.R.T.C.' I have never been the Chairman of K.S.R.T.C. Mr. Puttaswamy said that the factory made a profit of 8 lakhs. It is not correct. In 1972-73 it made a profit of 5.92 lakhs; in 1973-74 it made a profit of Rs. 3.19 lakhs; in 1974-75 it incurred a loss of Rs. 45.69 lakhs; in 1975-76 it incurred a loss of Rs. 22.26 lakhs and in 1976-77 it incurred a loss of Rs. 20.69 lakhs. Regarding investments in the company, the equity was Rs. 100 lakhs and loan Rs. 212 lakhs and the total is Rs. 312 lakhs. The net worth of shares as on 31st March 1977 is as follows: Share-capital Rs. 100 lakhs and accumulated loss Rs. 88.64 lakhs.

This was the position. Many doubts are expressed which are not correct. The management did not have the professional and technical know how. Remco and Porcelain Factories have gone together. Then they asked: What has happened to the Managing Director Mr. Krishnappa? He is still there. He is made the Special Officer. He has been offered the Deputy Manager's post on higher emoluments at Hyderabad. He has not shown inclination to the Hyderabad offer. He is coming back. His leave expires by the end of this month probably.

Thirty persons were retrenched. These workers were appointed without placing before the recruitment committee. It is a fact this Board was reconstituted in the year 1976. After considerable discussion among officials of BHEL and Industries Department along with the Chief Secretary, an Ordinance was brought in 1977 October. I have now brought this Bill to replace the Ordinance.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Kindly tell us the reasons for the delay. In 1977 you got the Ordinance.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—It was for bringing of Bill in the Assembly or something like that. There is nothing fishy about it. It has been done only in the interests of the industry and in national interests.

There is an agreement that the working conditions will not be changed. As regards Mr. Fernandaz's question regarding provident fund etc., we will see that they are made available, immediately.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Ordinarily, in a matter like this, there should be a correspondence between the two Governments, failing which there will be correspondence at least at the company level. If there is no correspondence, at least it is the practice in an industry to reduce the discussions into writing. I have been making a request to the Government to kindly tell us what is the correspondence.

SRI AZIZ SAIT.—Discussions were held in the chambers of the Chief Secretary wherein the officials of the Department of Industries were present. Do you mean to say the BH&L will take over without documents?

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Now that the Hon. Minister has agreed that there is an agreement, we would like to know what that document is.

SRI H. D. DEVE GOWDA.—Government should present all this information in the House.

SRI AZIZ SAIT.—I will place the agreement copy on the table of the House.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—This is not a matter which can be decided by minority or majority. This is a matter that has to be decided by the Speaker. I have every right to appeal to the Hon. Speaker to protect our rights. I have since yesterday been saying that there must have been some agreement or there must have been some exchange of letters. We would like to know about it.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I will place it on the table of the House.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I thank the Hon. Minister who has agreed to place it on the table of the House. It is all right. Can I take a decision to vote either for or against without looking into those documents? It is a matter for the Hon. Speaker to decide and I agree to abide by the ruling of the Chair.

SRI AZIZ SAIT.—Can I make 500 copies and distribute the same to the hon. Members?

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I should have time to verify or to look into it.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I have already made a statement to place it on the table of the House. The matter may be put to vote and a decision taken.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Our stand is that it is a package deal. There must have been some correspondence between the State Government and the B.H.E.L. We still hold the view that they have dictated the terms to the State Government unless this Porcelains Factory is handed over, REMCO will not be taken. This has been denied by the Hon. Minister. For taking over REMCO, Porcelains Factory should also be handed over was one of the pre-conditions imposed by them. This is a condition precedent. This is our view. Therefore, we appeal to the Chair to get all the records and verify it. In our view, the Hon. Minister is trying to mislead the House and suppressing the correspondence.

SRI J.H. PATEL.—This demand was continuously made since yesterday. In his answer, he stated that there was no document.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I never said that there was no document. I am extremely sorry for the views of the hon. Member. How can there be a deal without any correspondence? It is not an ordinary thing of giving five paise or ten paise from the pocket. They have to pay something according to the agreement and the Government of Karnataka has also to pay something.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—We know there is a final agreement.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I have agreed to place it on the table of the House.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—The agreement is there. Before the agreement is entered into, our stand is, they have dictated the terms to the State Government to the effect that unless the Porcelains Factory is handed over, they are not prepared to take REMCO. If we see the correspondence, we may be in a position to know the truth. Therefore, the Hon. speaker may kindly call for the records and look into it. Our stand is, it is a package deal.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—I have said earlier that both the factories have gone together. REMCO means Porcelain, Porcelain means REMCO. Even as a joke, I was telling that the relationship between the two was like husband and wife. There was no such condition that REMCO will be taken if Porcelain factory is given along with it. It is a package of industries. You can name anything. It can be twisted in any way. I can also twist English in several ways. I can say both are one.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—We would like to know the indissoluble tie.

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—How did it come, I cannot answer.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—It is a package deal. They are independent units. Both industries are separate. There may be some co-ordination between these two industries. Our stand is they were not prepared to take REMCO unless Porcelain is handed over to them. Let the Hon. Chair look into the correspondence and tell us whether the stand taken by the Hon. Minister is correct or our stand is correct. We stand corrected if we are wrong.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That the Mysore Porcelains Limited (Acquisition of Shares) Bill, 1978 be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

CLAUSES 2 to 20

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That Clauses 2 to 20, both inclusive, do stand part of the bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 to 20, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

CLAUSE 1, etc.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That Clause 1 the long Title, the Preamble and the Enacting Formula do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted

Clause 1, the long Title, the Preamble and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

MOTION TO PASS

SRI AZEEZ SAIT.—Sir I beg to move.

“That the Mysore Porcelains Limited (Acquisition of Shares) Bill, 1978 be passed.”

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That the Mysore Porcelains Limited (Acquisition of Shares) Bill, 1978 be passed.”

The motion was adopted and the Bill was passed